

**Remarks****Double Patenting**

Claim 23 was rejected under Section 101 "as claiming the same invention as that of claim 23 of prior U.S. Patent No. King et al. (U.S. 5,677,566)." There is no Claim 23 in patent no. 5,677,566 – the patent only has eighteen claims. If the Office is suggesting that Claim 23 in the instant application is the same as Claim 14 in the '566 patent, then the Office is respectfully requested to consider the fact that Claim 14 of the '566 patent does not include the following limitations from Claim 23 of the application: (1) a first surface and a second surface perpendicular to and intersecting the first surface; (2) conductive leads extending along the first surface at least to the intersection of the first and second surfaces; and (3) solder balls. Clearly, it is possible to infringe Claim 14 without also infringing Claim 23.


The double patenting rejection should be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under Section 103**

Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Abbott (5777382) in view of other references. Abbott was filed on December 19, 1996. The instant application has a priority date of May 8, 1995.<sup>1</sup> Abbott, therefore, is not prior art. For this reason alone, the Section 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,974  
(208) 433-1991 x204

<sup>1</sup> This application is a continuation of Application Serial No. 08/910,500 filed August 4, 1997, now U.S. Patent No. 6,232,213, which is a continuation of Application Serial No. 08/436,522 filed May 8, 1995, now U.S. Patent No. 5,677,566. See, Response/Amendment filed August 22, 2002.

Response To Office Action –3–

MICR135.02  
09/834,696